AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 10/015,881
Attorney Docket No. Q67742

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

REMARKS

Claims 1-36 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-36 are amended. No new matter is presented.

Dealing with preliminary matters first, Applicant notes that the Examiner has not indicated that the certified copy of the priority document, JP 2000-393709, has been received. In this regard, Applicant notes that the Office Action of March 7, 2005 states that "some of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received." However, the certified copy of JP 2000-393709 was filed on December 17, 2001. Therefore, Applicant believes that all the required certified copies have been received and the Examiner is kindly requested to indicate receipt of the certified copy in the next action.

In addition, Applicant notes that the Examiner has not indicated acceptance of the replacement drawings submitted with the Amendment of July 7, 2005. The Examiner is requested to indicate acceptance of these drawings in the next action.

To summarize the Office Action, claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, 15-19, 21-25, 27-31 and 33-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being allegedly unpatentable over Martinez et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0018800, hereinafter "Martinez"), in view of Marui et al. (US 4,061,212, hereinafter "Marui"), and claims 2, 8, 14, 20, 26 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martinez and Marui, further in view of Lund (US Patent 5,978,806). The outstanding rejections are addressed below.

17

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 10/015,881
Attorney Docket No. Q67742

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

As previously noted, claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, 15-19, 21-25, 27-31 and 33-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Martinez in view of Marui. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Independent claims 1, 13 and 25

With respect to independent claims 1, 13, and 25, Applicant submits that these claims define a novel mobile communications terminal and speech recognition method for a mobile communications terminal presenting new features. For instance, a plurality of directories are registered with voice patterns, wherein each directory is registered with a corresponding voice pattern. *See, e.g.*, Specification at pages 11-12. Further, each directory includes a plurality of contact data types, such that the plurality of contact data types comprises telephone number contact data and at least one other type of contact data. *See, e.g.*, Specification at page 11 at lines 13-20. In addition, a speech recognition process provides for a registered voice pattern to be retrieved which matches or nearly matches voice data obtained from a user, and a directory is selected that corresponds to the retrieved voice pattern. *See, e.g.*, Specification at page 12. Thus, the speech recognition method provides for a desired directory corresponding to a voice pattern to be selected, and the contents of the directory, including telephone number contact data together with other types of contact data, can be utilized by the mobile communications terminal for communicating with a contact. *See, e.g.*, Specification at page 16 and page 18, lines 1-10. In one exemplary embodiment, the types of contact data in each directory comprise telephone

18

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 10/015,881
Attorney Docket No. Q67742

number contact data, electronic mail address contact data, and URL (uniform resource locator) contact data.

Notwithstanding the Examiner's rejection of independent claims 1, 13 and 25, Applicant submits that the combination of Martinez in view of Marui, whether taken alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of these claims.

For instance, Martinez teaches a telecommunications system 14 of a communications network 10 in which a user dials into the telecommunications system 14 from a communication device, such as a user's home phone, work phone, or cellular phone. *See* Martinez at paragraphs 53-54 and 58. As taught by Martinez, the user places a call to a particular contact by using speech commands, such as "call Bob at home". *See* Martinez at paragraph 62.

However, Martinez merely teaches that various telephone number contact data, such as home, work, mobile, and pager telephone numbers, are retrieved based on speech recognition. *See* Martinez at paragraphs 59 and 67. Thus, Martinez fails to teach or suggest that a plurality of directories are registered with voice patterns, as claimed, wherein each directory of the plurality of directories is registered with a corresponding voice pattern, each directory including a plurality of contact data types comprising telephone number contact data and at least one other type of contact data. Indeed, Martinez teaches that contact data is accessed via an "address book web page", in which a user interacts with the data by clicking on images or text displayed on the web page to address features of the personal address book. *See* Martinez at paragraph 113.

19

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 10/015,881
Attorney Docket No. Q67742

Further, the teaching of Marui fails to compensate for the deficient teaching of Martinez. Indeed, Marui teaches voice registration only for telephone number data. *See* Marui at col. 14, lines 49-57. In this regard, Applicant notes that Marui merely teaches that a phone number is registered to a "two-digit address corresponding to a 9-digit telephone number." *See* Marui at col. 14, lines 8-17. Further, Marui teaches that a voice input, such as "office", is registered to a phone number which has been registered to a corresponding two-digit address. *See* Marui at col. 14, lines 18-57. However, the registration of a voice print to a corresponding "two-digit address", in which a single telephone number is stored, does not suggest *at least* the feature of registering a plurality of directories with voice patterns, wherein each directory of the plurality of directories is registered with a corresponding voice pattern, each directory including a plurality of contact data types comprising telephone number contact data and at least one other type of contact data, as claimed.

As evidenced by the foregoing, the combination of Irvin and Marui fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of independent claims 1, 13 and 25. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

With respect to dependent claims 4, 16 and 28, Applicant notes that the Examiner does not identify any portion of Martinez and Marui which allegedly teaches automatically designating the type of contact data based on an application activation status of the mobile communication terminal. As discussed above, Marui simply teaches registering a voice pattern to a phone number stored in a two-digit storage location, and Martinez likewise fails to teach any automatic designation of a type of contact data which is based on an application activation status.

20

as claimed. Thus, dependent claims 4, 16 and 28 are also believed to be allowable at least because the features recited by these claims are neither taught nor suggested by the applied art.

Further, Applicant submits that claims 2-6, 14-18 and 26-30 are allowable at least by virtue of their respective dependency from independent claims 1, 13 and 25. Thus, withdrawal of the rejections of these claims is requested.

Independent claims 7, 19 and 31

Independent claims 7, 19 and 31 define a novel mobile communications terminal and speech recognition method for a mobile communications terminal wherein voice patterns are registered with a plurality of contact data, wherein the plurality of contact data comprise a plurality of contact data types. *See, e.g.*, Specification at page 16. In addition, for each type of contact data, a voice pattern is registered with a corresponding contact data item independent of other types of contact data. *See, e.g.*, Specification at page 17. Further, the type of contact data to be selected for communication is designated and a contact data item of the type designated which corresponds to a voice pattern retrieved by a speech recognition process is selected. *See, e.g.*, Specification at page 17. Thus, by registering voice patterns with corresponding contact data items separately for each type of contact data and designating a type of contact data to be selected, the accuracy and efficiency of speech recognition is improved because only the registered voice patterns which correspond to the designated type of contact data are required to be searched when searching for a voice pattern. *See, e.g.*, Specification at page 18, lines 6-14 and Figure 5.

21

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 10/015,881
Attorney Docket No. Q67742

As discussed above with respect to independent claims 7, 19 and 31, Martinez merely teaches that various telephone number contact data, such as home, work, mobile, and pager telephone numbers, are retrieved based on speech recognition. *See* Martinez at paragraphs 59 and 67. Thus, Martinez fails to teach or suggest registering voice patterns with a plurality of contact data, as claimed, wherein the contact data comprises a plurality of contact data types, and for each type of contact data, a voice pattern is registered with a corresponding contact data item independent of other contact data types.

Further, Marui fails to compensate for the deficient teaching of Martinez. As noted above, Marui merely teaches that a phone number is registered to a "two-digit address corresponding to a 9-digit telephone number." *See* Marui at col. 14, lines 8-17. Moreover, as Marui merely teaches registration of phone number data, Marui cannot properly be relied upon to teach the registration of contact data which comprises a plurality of contact data types, wherein a voice pattern is registered with a corresponding contact data item independent of other contact data types, as claimed.

As demonstrated by the foregoing, all the limitations of independent claims 7, 19 and 31 are neither taught nor suggested by the combination of Martinez in view of Marui. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is requested.

With respect to dependent claims 10, 22 and 34, Applicant again disagrees that the combination of Martinez and Marui teaches automatically designating the type of contact data based on an application activation status of the mobile communication terminal, as claimed. As

22

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 10/015,881
Attorney Docket No. Q67742

discussed above. Marui simply teaches registering a voice pattern to a phone number stored in a two-digit storage location, and Martinez likewise fails to teach any automatic designation of a type of contact data which is based on an application activation status, as claimed. Thus, dependent claims 4, 16 and 28 are also believed to be allowable at least because this feature is neither taught nor suggested by the applied art.

Further, Applicant submits that dependent claims 8-12, 20-24 and 32-36 are allowable at least by virtue of their respective dependency from independent claims 7, 19 and 31. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is requested.

Dependent claims 2, 8, 14, 20, 26 and 32

As noted above, claims 2, 8, 14, 20, 26 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martinez et al. (US 2002/0018800), in view of Marui et al. (US 4,061,212), and further in view of Lund (US Patent 5,978,806). Without commenting substantively on these grounds of rejection, Applicant submits that claims 2, 8, 14, 20, 26 and 32 are allowable at least by virtue of depending from claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 25 and 31, respectively.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

23

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 10/015,881
Attorney Docket No. Q67742

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Brian K. Shelton
Registration No. 50,245

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 4, 2006

Certificate of Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is
being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and
Trademark Office Fax No. 571-273-8300 on
January 4, 2006.

Brian K. Shelton
Registration No. 50,245

24